

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0198 (3550.Palm) (fka 025782-0102)

### REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claim 14 is requested to be cancelled without prejudice.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-13 and 15-30 are now pending in this application.

### Claim Objections

In Section 1 of the Office Action the Examiner objected to Claim 14 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicants have cancelled Claim 14 without prejudice in accordance with one of the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the objection to claim 14 be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In Section 3 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 1-30 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crocker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,915,265) in view of Tsang (U.S. Patent No. 5,961,617). The Examiner indicates that Crocker, et al. teaches all of the claim limitations of Claims 1-30 except for the fact that "Crocker fails to explicitly suggest or teach the UMA provides power saving while providing performance that is acceptable to user." Examiner indicates that this is what Tsang teaches at Column 1, lines 16-50. With regard to Independent Claims 1, 15, and 22, applicants respectfully submit that Crocker et al., in view of Tsang does not teach all of the claim limitations of any of these independent claims. In particular, Crocker et al.,

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0198 (3550.Palm) (flca 025782-0102)

combined with Tsang does not teach "the display logic is configured to change the display mode and the size of the frame buffered during the operation of an application running on the computing device according to changing graphical needs of the application, available unified memory space, and available power." First, Crocker et al. in view of Tsang does not teach that the display mode and the size of the frame buffer are changed during operation of an application. In fact, what is taught in Crocker et al. is that decisions about the size of the memory needed for the frame buffer are made and the user is then informed of a need to reboot the computer, and the operating system is shut down and computer is rebooted. See, for example, FIG. 6 of Crocker et al. and accompanying text. Throughout Crocker et al. the process is described in which a need to reboot the system when the resolution or color is changed. This differs from applicants' invention in which the display mode and the frame buffer size are changed by the display logic during operation of the application. Accordingly, a need to reboot the computer is not what is claimed by applicants.

Further, according to Applicants' independent claims, the change in the size of the frame buffer and the change in the display mode are made based on a combination of the available unified memory space, the available power, and the graphical needs of the application. Nothing in either of Crocker et al. or Tsang discloses, teaches, or suggests that the decision about changing the display mode and changing the size of the frame buffer are based on a combination of the available unified memory space, the available power, and the graphical needs of the application. Tsang teaches that graphical modes could be changed to save power and Crocker et al. teaches that a shared memory buffer size could be changed based on available memory, however, there is no logic which takes into account all three factors and utilizes all three factors in the logic to make a decision about the display mode to be used and the size of the frame buffer. Accordingly, the invention recited in Applicant's Independent Claims 1, 15, and 22 are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by any proper combination of Crocker et al. and Tsang. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that Independent Claims 1, 15, and 22 and their respective dependent claims be allowed.

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0198 (3550.Palm) (fka 025782-0102)

Applicants respectfully submit that although Applicants believe that Independent Claims 1, 15, and 22 are allowable, applicants also wish to address the fact that limitations of the Dependent claims are missing from the cited references. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974).

For example, with regard to Dependent Claim 4, "wherein the display mode is dependent upon the available memory bandwidth" is not taught by either Crocker et al. or Tsang. Applicants request that the Examiner indicate how Crocker et al. and Tsang teach the limitation of Claim 4 or indicate the allowance of Claim 4.

Similarly, with regard to Claim 7, Crocker et al. or Tsang do not disclose or teach "wherein the more than one display mode includes an 18 bit color display mode." As well, there is no teaching in Crocker et al. or Tsang of Claim 9 in which "the more than one display mode includes an 8 bit display mode." Applicants submit that Tsang teaches the use of 24 bit, 16 bit, and 1 bit display modes, but not those of 18 bit and 24 bit. Accordingly, Applicants request the allowance of Claims 7 and 9.

With regards to Claims 10 and 11, neither Crocker et al. nor Tsang discloses or teaches "the more than one display mode includes a display mode having up to 25,600 pixels" (Claim 10) or "the more than one display mode includes a display mode having up to 102,400 pixels" (Claim 11). Applicants submit that the display modes disclosed in Tsang, for example, have many more pixels, including 640 x 480 and 1024 x 1024 resolutions. Both are more than 102,400 pixels. Accordingly, applicants request the allowance of Claims 10 and 11.

With regard to Claim 29, neither Crocker et al. nor Tsang discloses or teaches "the computing device is included in a cellular phone." All of the devices described in Crocker et al. and Tsang are conventional computer type devices and a cellular phone is not disclosed. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the allowance of Claim 29.

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0198 (3550.Palm) (fka 025782-0102)

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance.  
Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 04, 2004

By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 26371  
Telephone: (414) 297-5730  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,603